

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
6

7 NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC,)

8 Plaintiff,)

9 vs.)

10 GIAVANNA HOMEOWNERS)
11 ASSOCIATION, et al.,)

12 Defendants.)

Case No. 2:15-cv-01992-LDG-CWH

ORDER

13 Presently before the court is Defendant SFR Investment Pool 1, LLC's ("SFR") motion for
14 reconsideration (ECF No. 89), filed on March 15, 2017. Plaintiff Nationstar Mortgage LLC
15 ("Nationstar") filed a response (ECF No. 96) on March 29, 2017. SFR filed a reply (ECF No. 101)
16 on April 5, 2017.

17 SFR moves for reconsideration of the undersigned's order (ECF No. 87) granting in part
18 and denying in part Nationstar's emergency motion for protection from its Rule 30(b)(6)
19 deposition, arguing that the order is contrary to intervening case law regarding Nevada
20 homeowners' associations liens. Nationstar opposes the motion, arguing that SFR fails to
21 specifically identify how the court should alter its ruling on the 30(b)(6) deposition topics at issue.

22 Under Local Rule 59-1(a), a party seeking reconsideration of an interlocutory order "must
23 state with particularity the points of law or fact that the court has overlooked or misunderstood.
24 Changes in legal or factual circumstances that may entitled the movant to relief also must be stated
25 with particularity." Here, SFR's motion includes an analysis of the intervening changes in HOA
26 lien case law since the undersigned's order was entered, but SFR does not provide the court with
27 concrete proposals for altering the court's ruling on each deposition topic based on these changes in
28 the law. Even with the argument provided for the first time in SFR's reply regarding individual

1 deposition topics, it is unclear to the court exactly how SFR requests that the court change each of
2 its rulings. The court therefore will deny the motion without prejudice for failure to comply with
3 LR 59-1(a). If SFR chooses to re-file the motion, it is directed to set forth the full text of each of
4 the disputed deposition topics followed by (1) the court's current ruling set forth in its order (ECF
5 No. 87) dated March 1, 2017, and (2) specific proposed rulings on each of the topics at issue,
6 supported by points and authorities.

7 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant SFR Investment Pool 1, LLC's motion for
8 reconsideration (ECF No. 89) is DENIED without prejudice.

9
10 DATED: April 24, 2017

11
12 
13 **C.W. Hoffman Jr.**
14 **United States Magistrate Judge**
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28